ATTACHMENT 1

LABORATORY ANALYTICAL DATA COLLECTED AS PART OF THE ADDITIONAL INVESTIGATION

Analytical Results	
Sample Screen Date solved Introgen Too	Perchlorate (6°°Cl) Groundwater (6°°Cl) Groundwater (6°°Cl) Groundwater (6°°Cl) Broundwater (6°°Cl) Del He30 Del He4 Tritium/Helium (°H³ He Age) ^(I) Strontium (³H) Name (1834) Strontium (³H) Name (1834) Strontium (³H) Name (1834) Name (1
MW-1 NA 06/05/05 7.6 14.1 0.8 222 0.60 14.9 0.830J (1) 0.31 ND (5) 0.30 ND (0.1) 1.3 ND (1) 54.8 68.3 30.0 3.9 21.4 26.4 360 ND (2) 200 ND (0.1) 0.1 595 470 17	-6.5 -42.7 0.06 NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ 3.902 0.7113 0.438 positive positive
MW-16 NA 02/09/06	
MW-17 1 08/15/05 7.1 24.4 11.2 204 34.1 4.32 2.39 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND(0.2) ND (0.1) 0.63 ND (1) 19.4 35.5 14.4 ND (2) 11.6 6.5 190 ND (4)(h) 126 ND (0.1) 0.277 311 250 21	-7.5 -49.1 2.929 0.7114 0.2513
1 Dup 09/12/05 ND (4) ND (4) ND (5) 0.29 ND (5) 0.29 ND (5) 0.29 ND (6) 0.24 S ND (4) 0.24 S ND (6) 0.24 S ND (6) 0.24 S ND (7) 0.24 S N	-7.7 -55.6 6.596 0.7112 0.8619
4 08/15/05 6.2 19.9 11.2 178 34.3 2.79 2.31 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 0.21 ND (1) 19.0 18.1 46.9 2.4 4.8 10.1 235 ND (4) 126 ND (0.1) 0.549 323 250 22	A(^{m)} -7.5 -51.0 0.17 18.5 29.0 1.073 11.7 7.750 0.7116 0.6489 positive negative -7.5 -52.0 0.537 0.7108 0.150 0.150 0.150
5 08/15/05 5.9 18.0 11.6 233 36.8 1.87 1.85 63 8.02 55 ND (0.1) ND (0.1) ND (0.1) ND (1) 95.3 65.7 59.8 5.1 23.5 48.1 185 ND (4) ^(h) 123 ND (0.1) 0.181 317 220 21	-7.9 -55.2 0.865 0.7110 ^(e) 0.149 ^(e)
MW-18 1 07/21/05 6.9 30.5 12.7 195 40.0 7.82 1.91 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 1.6 ND (1) 33.1 41.9 15.8 2.6 14.0 9.5 236 ND (4) ⁰ 127 ND (0.1) ND (0.1) 364 270 19 2 19 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10 10	-7.5 -49.8
2 Dup 07/21/05	-7.0 -48.7 2.394 0.7116 0.456
4 07/21/05 5.9 27.3 10.9 210 44.4 7.29 1.36 0.22 ND (5) 0.22 ND (0.1) 1.1 ND (1) 24.2 39.0 29.3 2.1 13.4 10.7 560 10.2 163 ND (0.1) ND (0.1) 405 340 22 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1	-6.9 -42.3 0.337 0.7122 0.402 -6.7 -44.2 0.136 0.7105 0.166
MW-19 1 07/20/05 7.5 29.7 8.5 166 43.1 8.67 2.98 2.5 ND (5) 2.5 ND (0.1) 1.4 ND (1) 26.3 42.5 19.8 3.4 16.8 20.1 600 ND (4) 145 0.202 0.473 409 420 19	-7.7 -52.8 1.153 0.7111 0.383
2 07/20/05 7.0 29.3 8.6 276 0.14 8.07 1.78 0.47 ND (5) 0.47 ND (5) 0.47 ND (0.1) 12.0 ND (0.1) 135 115 34.4 ND (2) 43.1 92.0 736 6.7 201 0.144 0.389 1,040 280 20 -18.2 0.17 (0.1) 130 0.17 ND (0.1) 140 0.18 ND ().48
4 07/20/05 6.0 26.6 9.3 164 0.11 1.79 1.34 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.1) 7.4 ⁽⁶⁾ ND (1) 57.8 69.7 33.3 ND (2) 31.9 54.4 494 3.0J (4) 191 0.277 0.533 718 390 16	-7.2 -50.5 3.927 0.7109 0.672
4 Dup 07/20/05 1.84 1.62 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 7.3 (*) ND (0.1) 58.1 71.5 33.9 2.2 32.7 54.8 450 186 ND (0.1) 0.611 706 7.6 (*) 7.6 (*) 7.6 (*) 7.5 (*)	-7.4 -50.4 <u>9.255</u> 0.7110 0.775
MW-20 1 08/01/05 6.8 28.8 11.1 126 66.6 3.62 1.94 ND (0.2) ^(g) ND (5) ND (0.2) ^(g) ND (0.1) 6.1 ND (1) 78.7 82.3 ^(g) 20 ^(g) 2.7 ^(g) 26.3 ^(g) 31.0 440 2.2J (4) 274 ND (0.1) 0.588 636 340 18	-7.7 -51.1
2 08/01/05 7.0 26.6 10.7 92 41.6 2.62 1.95 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) DD (0.2) ND (0.1) 2.2 ND (1) 28.7 51.2 13.8 2.5 16.9 13.4 275 ND (4) 144 0.119 0.357 424 310 20 3 08/01/05 6.0 25.8 10.9 113 60.2 2.47 2.27 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 2.9 ND (1) 25.6 50.6 58.1 ND (2) 15.6 32.5 340 ND (4) 195 0.153 0.525 576 430 21	-7.2 47.7 3.352 0.7108 0.373 -6.8 45.5 2.475 0.7113 0.490
4 08/01/05 6.5 23.1 10.3 -35 34.7 2.10 1.58 0.50 ND (5) 0.50 ND (5) ND (0.1) ND (0.1) ND (0.1) 3.25 14.6 12.8 59.1 ND (2) 3.5 10.1 205 ND (4) 128 ND (0.1) 0.420 331 260 21 5 08/01/05 6.1 20.2 11.1 -39 36.6 2.62 1.78 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 0.388 307 260 23	-7.5 -51.6 1.190 0.7110 0.110 -7.3 -48.4 0.079 0.7101 0.092
MW-21 1 07/26/05 7.4 32.2 9.9 156 0.14 4.18 2.58 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 14.2 ND (0.1) 152 126 34.2 2.7 40.9 103 760 9	-7.9 -58.3
2 07/26/05 7.4 25.9 11.6 161 0.18 8.44 2.70 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.1) 0 10.7 ND (<1) 0 10.7 ND (<1) 0 10.7 ND (<1) 0 15 ND (<1) 0 15 ND (0.1)	-8.2 -57.4 8.040 0.7106 1.290
3 07/26/05 7.5 25.9 9.8 171 0.16 3.29 2.37 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 0 9.5 ND (0.1) 0 150 44.4 3.4 47.0 108 900 3.0 J (4) 275 ND (0.1) 0.567 1,160 590 21 3.0 ND (0.7) 0 1726/05 3.0 ND (0.7) 0 1726/0	8.229 0.7109 0.999
4 07/26/05 6.2 25.6 10.9 59 0.12 2.48 2.07 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1)(0) 6.5(0) ND (0.1)(0) 96.5 96.8 30.5 2.4 29.9 64.3 545(0) 2.0J (4) 178 ND (0.1) 0.514 761 400 18 5 07/26/05 5.1 22.8 12.1 200 0.13 2.38 1.97 ND (0.2) ND (0.1) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) ND (0.1) ND (0.1)(0) 7.1E(0) ND (0.1)(0) 177 99.6 35.3 2.3 32.9 66.5 590(0) 3.3J (4) 181 ND (0.1) 0.420 808 390 19	-8.1 -57.9 3.878 0.7109 0.603 -8.3 -62.1 4.996 0.7110 0.723
1 Dup 07/25/05 1.74 1.59 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 1.5 ND (1) 40.5 55.1 19.4 ND (2) 18.2 28.4 310 670 159 ND (0.1) 0.766 488	0.30 -6.7 -47.3 0.03 19.3 4.5 0.863 5.4 3.131 0.7114 0.387 positive positive
2 07/25/05 7.0 25.0 8.8 145 45.0 2.08 1.60 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 1.8 ND (1) 18.9 32.9 43.6 3.1 13.6 36.1 270 79.1 144 0.111 0.308 451 290 18 NA (10 N	A ^(m) -7.0 -45.6 0.03 436 821 1.700 NA ^(k) 3.194 0.7120 0.370 -6.8 -43.7 0.788 0.7130 0.297
4 07/25/05 5.5 24.3 10.0 82 34.0 1.83 1.67 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.1) 0.26 ND (1) 7.8 9.8 43.3 2.5 9.5 13.5 175 ND (4) ¹⁰ 127 0.254 0.681 297 220 18 5 07/25/05 7.3 26.4 10.1 203 39.9 4.22 1.52 ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.1) 1.3 ND (1) 19.0 34.3 39.9 2.2 9.3 9.5 235 ND (4) ¹⁰ 164 ND (0.1) 0.340 394 330 17	-6.9 -44.0 0.299 0.7109 0.242 -7.0 -46.7 0.171 0.7112 0.345
5 07/29/05 7.3 20.4 10.1 203 39.9 4.22 1.32 ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 1.3 ND (1) 19.0 34.3 39.9 2.2 9.3 9.3 235 ND (4) 104 ND (0.1) 0.340 394 330 17 5 Dup 09/09/05	-7.0 -40.7 0.7712 0.343
	2.05 -7.0 NA ^(m) -0.02 159 190 1.111 NA ^(k) 5.549 0.7110 0.696
	0.18
	2.19 -6.7 -44.8 0.13 190 35.4 0.468 NA ^(k) 2.436 0.7112 0.519 0.141 0.7110 0.189
OU-1 11/22/06 -19.3 0.1	
LFWC No. 2 NA 06/03/05 6.4 19.7 10.6 211 0.72 0.923J ND (1) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (0.1) 9.0 ND (1) 73.0 73.5 24 ND (2) 24.8 38.9 460 6 157 ND (0.1) 0.327 638 360 24 -13.4 -0.13 1	1.10 -7.3 -48.4 0.06 NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ NA ⁽ⁱ⁾ 5.079 0.7115 0.483 positive negative
Sunset NA 06/02/05 7.8 19.2 7.2 234 0.88 17.1 0.969J(1) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.2) ND (5) ND (0.1) 8.5 ND (1) 119 108 37 3.5 34.6 58.4 420 12 221 ND (0.1) 0.322 875 500 22 -17.8 -0.06 0	IA ^(m) -6.9 -45.7 0.01 97.1 17.3 0.592 19.5 2.165 0.7112 0.292 negative negative negative negative negative
	3.01 -7.5 -52.6 0.03 45.3 27.4 0.866 23.1 2.589 0.7107 0.493 negative negative
Note: Water quality parameters and field measurements are analyzed laken for all walls and screens plus 10% for duplicates therefore there is a total of 45 samples.	

Note: Water quality parameters and field measurements are analyzed/taken for all wells and screens plus 10% for duplicates, therefore there is a total of 45 samples.

- (a) Operator noticed bubbles from the water pumped from the production wells (LAWC No. 3, LFWC No. 2, Garfield, Sunset, and Bangham). (b) DO and ORP measurements were taken at a later date by Geofon during the fifth quarter sampling (Oct/Nov 2006).
- (c) DOC results were consistently higher than TOC results. A special study conducted by the laboratory showed distilled and acidified water filtered with 0.45-µm filters with DOC concentrations at 7.6 and 20.8 mg/L, respectively indicating leaching from the filters. (d) Perchlorate was analyzed by EMAX for MW-1, LAWC No. 3, LFWC No. 2, Garfield, Sunset, and Bangham. For the rest of the sampling locations, perchlorate was analyzed by APCL. (e) Samples were recollected on August 23, 2005 due to laboratory error for NO 3 analysis.

- (f) Samples were recollected on August 22, 2005 due to laboratory error for NO $_{\rm 3}$ analysis.
- (g) Samples were recollected on August 22, 2006 because the initial samples arrived at the laboratory after the hold time. (h) Samples were recollected on September 12, 2005 because laboratory did not analyze samples as scheduled.
- (i) Samples were recollected on September 8, 2005 because laboratory did not analyze samples as scheduled.
- (j) Samples were collected on September 9, 2006 because laboratory did not analyze samples as scheduled. (f) samples were considered on september 9, 2006 because laboratory during analyze samples as scrieduled.

 (k) He³ results were not used due to large amounts of air components in the samples collected increasing the uncertainty of age determination.

 (l) MW-1 and LFWC-2 did not yield viable helium samples for analysis.
- (m) Samples were not analyzed by the laboratory as requested.
 (n) Method for identifying the presence of perchlorate-reducing bacteria.

- (n) Method for identifying the activity of the indigenous perchlorate-reducing bacteria.

 (o) Method for identifying the activity of the indigenous perchlorate-reducing bacteria.

 NA = not available; Dup = duplicate; ND = not detect; DO = dissolved oxygen; ORP = oxidation-reduction potential; DOC = dissolved organic carbon; TOS = total dissolved solids; J = result is positively identified although the result is less than the reporting limit but greater than the method detection limit; E = result is above the maximum calibration range.

DATA QUALITY

The data generated for this project were verified by the Battelle Project Quality Assurance Officer. The verification process for the laboratory data involved ensuring that the holding times, precision, accuracy, laboratory blanks and detection limits were within the criteria outlined in the work plan.¹

Precision was determined by calculating the relative percent difference (%RPD) between matrix spike/matrix spike duplicate (MS/MSD) pairs and laboratory control spike/laboratory control spike duplicate (LCS/LCSD) pairs in the analytical laboratory. All MS/MSD and LCS/LCSD samples met the precision (%RPD) criteria defined in the analytical methods.

Accuracy was determined by calculating the percent recovery (%R) for MS/MSD and for organic analytes, with surrogate compounds. Laboratory accuracy was also assessed from %R results generated from the periodic analysis of calibration check standards and laboratory control samples (LCS/LCSD). All MS/MSD and LCS/LCSD samples met the accuracy (%R) criteria defined in the analytical methods.

Sample analyses were conducted within the holding times specified in the work plan with the following exceptions: BioInsite performed the functional gene testing on groundwater samples from the MW-1 and the production wells 7 to 8 days post-collection. BioInsite performed the functional genenomic testing on groundwater samples from MW-24-1 and MW-25-3, 16 and 22 days post-collection. The maximum holding time requirement in the work plan was 48 hours. Samples were frozen by BioInsite at approximately -20°F upon receipt and until analysis.

In addition, dissolved organic carbon (DOC) analyzed by EMAX laboratories was consistently higher than total organic carbon (TOC) for all samples collected. EMAX conducted a special study in August 2005 by filtering both distilled water and acidified water through their 0.45-µm filters. The results for DOC were 7.6 and 20.8 mg/L for distilled and acidified water, respectively indicating leaching from the filters. Therefore, DOC results are not considered valid data.

The helium (He³) samples for productions wells (LAWC No. 3, LFWC No.2, Garfield, Sunset, and Bangham) had to be collected after an intermediate collector instead of directly at the wellhead due to the high flow rates of the production wells. In addition, University of Miami determined all He³ samples except MW-17-3 and MW-24-1, had large amounts of air components in them increasing the uncertainty of age determination. Therefore, the He³ results were not considered valid data.

Historical water quality data obtained from the various databases was evaluated for quality by doing a charge balance calculation. That is, the sum of the anions (A) and sum of the cations (C) should balance each other. Any deviation from zero is attributable to analytical error. Thus, a charge balance calculation, as show by the equation below, is a means to assess quality of older data sets.

Charge Balance (%) =
$$\frac{C-A}{C+A} \times 100$$

Samples having a charge balance within ±10% were regarded as being of good quality. Data for samples that did not meet this quality control criterion were rejected for consideration in this study.